

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 14 remain pending in the present application. Claims 12, 13 and 15 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 6-9, 11 and 14 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

ELECTION/RESTRICTIONS

Applicants respectfully request the rejoinder of Claims 10 and 11. Claim 11 has been amended to maintain consistency with amended Claim 1.

DRAWINGS

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Claim 15 has been cancelled. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

SPECIFICATION

The disclosure is objected to because of informalities. The specification has been amended to overcome the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 6-7 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The claims have been cancelled and/or

amended to overcome the rejection. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Driessen, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,107,970). Claims 1, 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamaguchi, et al. (2001/0023638). Claim 12 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 12 depended from Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 12 and Claim 12 has been cancelled. Thus, Applicants believe Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2, 5 and 8, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi, et al. (2001/0023638). Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi, et al. (2001/0023638) (Claims 6 and 7) or Driessen, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,107,970) (Claim 7) in view of Lizell, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,363,945). Claims 6, 7 and 9 ultimately depend from Claim 1. As stated above, Claim 1 has been amended and is now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of

record. Thus, Claims 6, 7 and 9 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 17, 2004

By. 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg